DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 405 394 UD 029 973

AUTHOR	Chow, Julian; Coulton, Claudia J.
TITLE	Schooling in Cleveland's Low-Income Neighborhoods: Locations, Enrollment & Performance.
INSTITUTION	Case Western Reserve Univ., Cleveland, OH. Center for Urban Poverty and Social Change.
SPONS AGENCY	Cleveland Foundation, Ohio.; Rockefeller Foundation, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE	Nov 90
NOTE	33p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Academic Achievement; Catholic Schools; *Dropout Rate; *Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Enrollment; Geographic Location; *Low Income Groups; Neighborhoods; Poverty; Private Schools; Public Schools; Test Results; *Urban Areas; Urban Problems
IDENTIFIERS	Cleveland Public Schools OH; *Ohio (Cleveland)

ABSTRACT

Fifteen of the lowest-income neighborhoods in Cleveland (Ohio) are the focus of this report, which is concerned with the schooling of students in these 15 neighborhoods. These areas encompass most of the traditional, new, and emerging poverty areas identified in a previous report. Sixty public and 22 private and Catholic schools are examined in this consideration of enrollment, dropout rates, and academic achievement in the neighborhoods. The public school enrollment is widely different among the neighborhoods, and enrollment in nonpublic schools is not distributed randomly across them. High school dropout rates are uniformly high throughout the public schools in all neighborhoods. Results on standardized reading and mathematics tests seldom exceed the national midpoint throughout the neighborhoods. The analysis suggests that the differences seen among the 15 neighborhoods are complicated by the fact that many children attend many different schools in many different places. Clearly no single model or approach can be applied to all neighborhoods. Three tables present overall findings, and an appendix contains 15 tables with dropout and school-performance data for each of the 15 neighborhoods. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 405 394

CENTER FOR URBAN POVERTY AND SOCIAL CHANGE

SCHOOLING IN CLEVELAND'S LOW-INCOME NEIGHBORHOODS: LOCATIONS, ENROLLMENT & PERFORMANCE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Chow
Case Western Univ.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences
Case Western Reserve University
Cleveland, Ohio

UD029773

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SCHOOLING IN CLEVELAND'S LOW-INCOME NEIGHBORHOODS: LOCATIONS, ENROLLMENT & PERFORMANCE

Julian Chow
Claudia J. Coulton

November, 1990

CENTER FOR URBAN POVERTY AND SOCIAL CHANGE
MANDEL SCHOOL OF APPLIED SOCIAL SCIENCES
CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY
CLEVELAND, OHIO

This analysis was supported in part by grants from the Rockefeller and Cleveland Foundations. However, the opinions expressed are those of the authors. The assistance of Jim Zafirau, Arthur Naparstek, Marcia Petchers, Grace Carroll and Henry Yan is gratefully acknowledged.

SCHOOLING IN CLEVELAND'S LOW-INCOME NEIGHBORHOODS:

LOCATIONS, ENROLLMENT & PERFORMANCE

Fifteen of Cleveland's lowest-income neighborhoods are the focus of this report. These areas encompass most of the traditional, new and emerging poverty areas identified in our report, An Analysis of Poverty and Related Conditions in Cleveland Area Neighborhoods. Included are the statistical planning areas known as: Broadway (North and South), Central, Cudell, Detroit-Shoreway, Fairfax, Glenville, Goodrich-Kirtland Park, Hough, Kinsman, Mt. Pleasant, Ohio City, St. Clair-Superior, Tremont, Union-Miles.

This report is concerned with the schooling of students who are living in these 15 neighborhoods. It is widely recognized that school facilities are key community resources and may be used as means to improve not only education for children but also services for all residents of the neighborhood. Both public and private/Catholic schools, therefore, are important assets of the neighborhoods. We will look at the number of schools and enrollment in the neighborhoods. For most of the Cleveland parents who have school-age children, they make decisions as to whether they will send their children to the public schools or not. We estimated the number and percent of school-age population who attended the Cleveland Public Schools in each of the 15 neighborhoods. We also examined the location of schools that the Public School students are attending. Finally, we

looked at the dropout rate and school performance of the neighborhood students.

Location of Schools

The location of schools is an important asset to the community. It is a symbol of the commitment of the community to education and it represents the stability of the neighborhood. Local residents are opposed to the closing of schools located in their neighborhoods because it has often resulted in the dropping of housing markets and creation of negative images of the community.

A total of 90 schools, 68 public and 22 private/Catholic, are located in our 15 neighborhoods. It is interesting to see that the schools are generally concentrated in a few neighborhoods. Ten public schools are located in Hough alone which also has the largest student enrollment in the City of Cleveland. Glenville has nine public schools, Central and Mt. Pleasant each have seven. These four neighborhoods make up one-half of the public schools in our 15 neighborhoods. South Broadway, on the other hand, has the largest number of private/Catholic schools (7) located in the area. No private or Catholic school, however, is located in either Central or Mt. Pleasant. Table 1A and 1B summarize the school locations and student enrollment in the 15 neighborhoods.[1] Since the public school students are likely to be transported to a school located in a different neighborhood, the majority of enrolled attenders

TABLE 1A: RANKING OF SPA BY PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT,[1] 1989

SPA	ELEMENTARY		MIDDLE SCHL		HIGH SCHOOL		TOTAL	
	#	ENROLL	#	ENROLL	#	ENROLL	#	ENROLL
HOUGH	7	3536	1	464	2	1605	10	5605
GLENVILLE	6	3473	3	1092			9	4565
CENTRAL	4	1757	1	562	2	1487	7	3806
MOUNT PLEASANT	5	2239	2	803			7	3042
DETROIT-SHOREWAY	4	2490	1	681	1	437	6	3608
SOUTH BROADWAY	3	1351	1	565	1	1184	5	3100
OHIO CITY	5	2625					5	2625
CUDELL	1	687			1	1726	2	2413
TREMONT	3	1840	1	505			4	2345
UNION-MILES	2	1476					2	1476
GOODRICH-KIRTLAND	1	483			2	616	3	1099
FAIRFAX	2	1011					2	1011
KINSMAN	2	1011					2	1011
NORTH BROADWAY	3	993					3	993
ST. CLAIR-SUPERIOR	1	298					1	298

[1] The source for the data is a publication by the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency entitled School Enrollment Report. School locations are geo-coded by the authors.

TABLE 1B: RANKING OF SPA BY PRIVATE/CATHOLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT,[1] 1989

SPA	ELEMENTARY #	ELEMENTARY ENROLL	MIDDLE SCHL #	MIDDLE SCHL ENROLL	HIGH SCHOOL #	HIGH SCHOOL ENROLL	TOTAL #	TOTAL ENROLL
SOUTH BROADWAY	6	1137			1	332	7	1469
OHIO CITY					1	1208	1	1208
ST.CLAIR-SUPERIOR	2	493					2	493
HOUGH	1	310					1	310
GLENVILLE	2	307					2	307
FAIRFAX	1	289					1	289
DETROIT-SHOREWAY	1	244					1	244
UNION-MILES	1	244					1	244
CUDELL	1	160	1	65			2	225
NORTH BROADWAY	1	223					1	223
GOODRICH-KIRTLAND	1	213					1	213
TREMONT	1	117					1	117
KINSMAN	1	88					1	88
CENTRAL							0	00
MOUNT PLEASANT							0	00

[1] The source for the data is a publication by the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency entitled School Enrollment Report. School locations are geo-coded by the authors.

would not live in the area. For Catholic or private schools, however, children are assigned to or attend the school near their residence.

School locations of neighborhood students

The location in which public school students attend schools has been a key element of discussion in this community. The transportation pattern is complicated and is developed through a complex process of grouping geographic areas in order to achieve a desired racial mix. The intention here is not to discuss the appropriateness of the transportation arrangement for the public school students. Instead, our analysis is focused on the locations of schools that neighborhood residents attend to facilitate thinking about the relationship between school and community.

Table 2 presents the public school locations for students who live in each neighborhood. As expected, the majority of the public school children do not attend schools in their own neighborhood. In several neighborhoods, however, a larger proportion of students live in the same areas that they attend school. For example, over 40 percent of the public school students living in Hough and Central attend schools located in their own neighborhood. Among children living in Glenville, Tremont and Mt. Pleasant, about one-third of them attend schools in their neighborhoods. Children in kindergarten and in lower grade levels are more likely to attend a school in their

TABLE 2: PUBLIC SCHOOL LOCATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD STUDENTS

Place where child attends school:	Place where child lives:														
	CENTRL	CUDELL	DE-TROIT-SHORE.	FAIR-FAX	GLEN-VILLE	GOOD-RICH/ KIRT.	HOUGH	KINS-MAN	MT. PLEAS.	NO. BROAD-WAY	OHIO CITY	SO. BROAD-WAY	ST. CLAIR	TRE-MONT	UNION-MILES
ARCHWOOD	10	8	11	5	14	3	8	50	566	1	7	22	5	9	958
BUCKEYE	8	13	17	12	25	3	20	4	22	4	11	7	13	2	17
CENTRAL	1894	8	26	48	107	5	97	208	106	406	28	455	43	115	251
CLARK/FULTON	3	5	64	3	722	2	15	2	9	1	156	3	33	156	10
CORLETT	10	4	9	6	23	1	17	15	212	25	1	5	8	45	199
CUDELL	53	489	353	209	274	26	351	81	20	1	45	9	24	10	16
DETROIT-SHOREWAY	22	110	890	221	282	19	314	12	49	9	82	7	142	30	47
DOWNTOWN	22	12	20	19	67	10	37	13	49	6	17	5	14	8	42
EDGEWATER	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EUCLID/GREEN	1	2	3	3	6	29	3	1	1	0	0	0	8	0	4
FAIRFAX	45	60	110	385	29	0	139	13	15	2	7	1	19	8	21
FOREST HILLS	22	18	150	17	699	0	44	8	17	1	145	4	52	42	23
GLENVILLE	33	92	121	26	2134	3	254	14	39	6	154	21	256	121	36
GOODRICH	15	8	16	13	61	305	269	19	46	3	7	8	138	6	47
HOUGH	76	146	383	136	355	141	2245	40	85	18	442	17	1105	35	95
INDUSTR. VALL.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JEFFERSON	6	76	10	4	16	1	14	10	575	2	2	0	3	3	41
KAMMS CORNER	2	9	2	2	3	0	2	2	18	0	2	2	0	0	14
KINSMAN	36	5	9	113	25	2	30	667	22	59	10	86	13	4	19
LEE/MILES	6	3	1	5	8	1	7	3	291	1	1	0	0	2	138
MT. PLEASANT	29	20	44	19	45	0	42	40	1772	8	20	22	34	18	291
NO. BROADWAY	333	1	7	7	11	0	18	22	11	273	5	238	7	3	10
NO. COLLINWOOD	5	2	2	5	20	0	5	6	5	0	1	1	12	0	2
OHIO CITY	19	46	383	18	365	14	206	19	25	1	679	4	92	64	26
OLD BROOKLYN	16	33	46	17	31	2	19	84	527	6	17	22	5	10	512
PURITAS	8	10	6	1	4	0	3	6	21	0	2	1	1	6	3
RIVERSIDE	2	1	3	0	2	0	3	3	88	0	0	0	3	0	41
SO. BROADWAY	458	9	21	25	33	0	42	563	101	295	12	643	26	116	630
SO. COLLINWOOD	10	3	8	9	49	4	52	4	18	1	10	3	32	2	13
ST. CLAIR	6	1	1	3	11	12	102	5	5	3	7	3	291	1	12
TREMONT	161	38	146	14	193	32	111	9	16	10	211	4	58	800	97
UNION-MILES	6	1	6	15	13	0	10	18	246	11	2	163	2	1	766
UNIVERSITY	16	134	122	206	210	11	58	21	77	1	14	15	22	7	49
WEST BLVD.	18	169	40	122	83	0	20	83	164	8	7	4	10	4	23
WOODLAND HILLS	32	97	162	135	20	3	26	86	64	2	7	2	16	6	29
TOTAL	3560	1747	3455	1919	6155	681	4810	2215	5421	1290	2264	1934	2642	1769	4614

own neighborhood than students in the upper grades. Children living in South and North Broadway are less likely to attend a school in their neighborhood; only about 15 percent of them do so.

Public School Enrollment

In order to describe the degree to which residents send their children to the public school system, we estimated the percent of school-age children living in each neighborhood who attended public schools.[2] The public school enrollment is widely different among neighborhoods. Table 3 shows that Union-Miles, Glenville, Mt. Pleasant and Kinsman are the four neighborhoods that have the highest public school enrollment rate. It is not surprising that South Broadway has the lowest percentage (42 percent) of public school attendance rate; they have the largest number of private/Catholic schools and student enrollment in their area. For the other neighborhoods, the public school attendance rate ranged from 68 percent to 92 percent. Enrollment in non-public schools, therefore, is not distributed randomly across neighborhoods.

School performance

High school dropout rates[3] are uniformly high throughout the public schools in all the neighborhoods. Students who live in Glenville, Union-Miles and Mt. Pleasant have a slightly lower

TABLE 3: RANKING OF PERCENT OF CHILDREN IN PUBLIC SCHOOL, 1987-1988

SPA	SCHOOL-AGE[1] POPULATION (5-19)	PUBLIC SCHOOL[2] STUDENTS (K-G12)	% PUBLIC SCHOOL ATTENDED
UNION-MILES	4713	4614	98%
GLENVILLE	6383	6155	97%
MT. PLEASANT	5631	5421	96%
KINSMAN	2306	2215	96%
HOUGH	5209	4810	92%
FAIRFAX	2338	1919	82%
ST. CLAIR-SUPERIOR	3350	2642	79%
CENTRAL	4573	3560	78%
GOODRICH-KIRTLAND PARK	923	681	74%
OHIO CITY/NWS	3151	2264	72%
TREMONT	2450	1769	72%
DETROIT-SHOREWAY	4892	3455	71%
NO. BROADWAY	1883	1290	69%
CUDELL	2586	1747	68%
SO. BROADWAY	4570	1934	42%

[1] The school-age population for 1985 are estimates prepared by The Urban Center, Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University. These estimates are reported in Cleveland Demographic Analysis and Projections, 1986.

[2] The data for the academic years 1987-1988 was obtained from the Research and Analysis Department, Cleveland Public Schools.

dropout rate (below 40 percent) among our 15 neighborhoods. This is also consistent with our earlier finding that these three neighborhoods have a high percentage of school-age children in public schools.

Achievement test scores have been widely used as an indicator to evaluate students' school performance. Results on standardized reading tests and math tests seldom exceed the national midpoint of 50 throughout our 15 neighborhoods. Students from Cudell generally performed better than students living in other neighborhoods. Students living in Central and Kinsman, in contrast, tend to have lower test scores across all grade levels. A complete list of dropout rates and achievement test scores for each of the 15 neighborhoods are included in the appendix.

The finding that the dropout rates and achievement test scores differed among neighborhoods should be interpreted cautiously. Both sets of scores were only available for the Cleveland Public School system. We can see from Table 1B and Table 3 that there is a large number of school-age children attending private or Catholic schools. As mentioned earlier, it is widely believed that enrollment in non-public schools is not randomly distributed across neighborhoods or across families. If we assume that it is the lower-income families that are more likely to send their children to public schools, this selection bias would depress any neighborhood effects on schooling.

Conclusion

Our analysis has suggested that school enrollment and performance differs among our 15 neighborhoods. Efforts to increase the links between school and community are also complicated by the fact that neighborhood children attend many different schools in many different places. Some neighborhoods have no schools at all. Catholic and private schools reach large portions of children in some of the areas examined. Clearly, there is no single model or approach that can be applied to all neighborhoods.

Notes

1. School enrollment data is obtained from the School Enrollment Report written by Edward May at the Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency. Locations of schools in the neighborhoods are geo-coded and compiled by the authors.

2. We estimated the percentage of an area's children, ages 5-19, who were attending grades K-12 of the Cleveland Public Schools. Population estimates by age group in 1985 were provided by the Urban Center (1986). Counts of children attending by grade and SPAs in 1987-1988 were compiled by the authors from data provided by the Cleveland Public School's Research & Data Analysis Department. These estimates should be interpreted cautiously because there is the potential for considerable error in the population estimates for small geographic areas.

3. This is an estimate of the number of public school students who begin 9th grade but will drop out before completion. The dropout rate is the total number of dropouts from grades 9-12 divided by the 9th grade enrollment. It is based on the assumption that the probability of dropping out at each grade level in 1987-1988 is a reasonable estimate of the probability today.

References

Coulton, C., Chow, J., & Pandey, S. (1990). An analysis of poverty and related conditions in Cleveland area neighborhoods. Cleveland, OH: Center for Urban Poverty & Social Change, Case Western Reserve University.

Coulton, C., & Pandey, S. (1990). Concentration of poverty and risk to children: An analysis of Cleveland's neighborhoods. Cleveland, OH: Center for Urban Poverty & Social Change, Case Western Reserve University.

May, E. (1990). School enrollment report. Cleveland, OH: Northeast Ohio Areawide Coordinating Agency.

Urban Center (1986). Cleveland demographic analysis & projections. Cleveland, OH: College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University.

APPENDIX

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

CENTRAL

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	42.60	40.87	50.63
Middle	(7-8)	---	40.18	37.24	41.62
High School	(9-12)	47.97	42.34	39.09	32.76

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

CUDELL

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	48.63	47.50	55.60
Middle	(7-8)	---	48.65	45.86	46.36
High School	(9-12)	55.64	52.17	49.61	43.99

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

DETROIT-SHOREWAY

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	46.22	44.64	52.99
Middle	(7-8)	---	47.65	45.01	47.83
High School	(9-12)	48.37	46.45	44.20	41.91

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

FAIRFAX

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	44.79	42.78	50.97
Middle	(7-8)	---	44.17	41.91	43.56
High School	(9-12)	40.33	42.82	40.61	36.13

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

GLENVILLE

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	45.64	44.46	52.93
Middle	(7-8)	---	45.32	41.88	45.34
High School	(9-12)	31.66	43.63	42.79	36.03

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

GOODRICH-KIRTLAND PARK

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	47.48	46.84	54.86
Middle	(7-8)	---	41.05	37.71	44.31
High School	(9-12)	36.96	53.67	52.68	46.70

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

HOUGH

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	43.74	42.14	48.31
Middle	(7-8)	---	42.10	40.01	42.57
High School	(9-12)	39.90	42.09	38.63	35.11

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

KINSMAN

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	41.68	39.27	49.19
Middle	(7-8)	---	41.67	38.03	40.91
High School	(9-12)	44.87	44.09	39.97	37.77

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

MOUNT PLEASANT

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	47.61	46.72	50.80
Middle	(7-8)	---	44.73	42.93	46.72
High School	(9-12)	35.02	44.51	43.58	39.64

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

NORTH BROADWAY

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	45.47	44.18	52.77
Middle	(7-8)	---	47.87	45.14	46.98
High School	(9-12)	61.95	49.84	44.47	39.55

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

OHIO CITY/NEAR WEST SIDE

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	43.48	41.76	48.72
Middle	(7-8)	---	44.36	40.84	43.52
High School	(9-12)	48.96	41.79	39.06	36.19

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

SOUTH BROADWAY

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	47.33	45.88	55.19
Middle	(7-8)	---	46.49	45.09	45.45
High School	(9-12)	47.56	50.65	45.98	40.33

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

ST. CLAIR-SUPERIOR

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	42.63	41.50	47.03
Middle	(7-8)	---	43.35	41.10	41.61
High School	(9-12)	47.03	42.65	40.40	36.01

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

TREMONT

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	42.92	41.76	49.66
Middle	(7-8)	---	41.93	38.91	44.94
High School	(9-12)	44.08	42.62	39.25	34.96

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

DROPOUT RATE AND SCHOOL PERFORMANCE, 1987-1988

UNION-MILES

		Dropout	Mean Reading Comprehension NCE Score	Mean Reading Total NCE Score	Mean Math NCE Score*
Elementary	(1-6)	---	45.54	44.65	50.76
Middle	(7-8)	---	43.84	42.73	45.92
High School	(9-12)	33.26	44.06	41.29	37.57

*Math tests were only given to Grades 3-6 in elementary school, Grades 7-8 in middle school, and Grade 9 in high school.

Center for Urban Poverty and Social Change
Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences
10900 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44106-7164

216-368-6946

CASE WESTERN RESERVE UNIVERSITY

33

BEST COPY AVAILABLE